

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7 and 19 are amended. Claims 1-19, as amended, remain in the application. No new matter is added by the amendments to the claims.

The Rejections:

In the Office Action dated September 17, 2008, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4 and 7-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Svensson-Hilford et al (US 6,354,405 B1).

The Examiner rejected Claims 5-6 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Svensson-Hilford, and further in view of Gazdzinski (US 6,615,175 B1).

The Response:

Applicant amended Claims 1, 7 and 19 to clarify that the authentication signal is unique to the person seeking to utilize the elevator system. (Page 4, Line 15 through Page 5, Line 27; Page 6, Lines 12-15)

Applicant's independent Claims 1, 7 and 19 recite a mobile authentication device for detecting an authentication signal unique to a person and generating an identification signal upon correspondence between the authentication signal and a person reference in response to a check by the mobile authentication device. The Svensson-Hilford and Gazdzinski patents do not show or suggest such a mobile authentication device.

The only mobile devices mentioned in Svensson-Hilford are tokens with electronic chips, prepayment cards, keys with data carriers with individual data relating to the user, cards or other data carriers with individual data relating to the user and a remotely operating transmitter/receiver system with individual data relating to the user or the goods (column 3, lines 25-35). These devices are used to enter the data into the fixed identification device 15. These devices do not detect an authentication signal unique to a person and do not generate an identification signal upon correspondence between the authentication signal and a person reference in response to a check by the device.

Gazdzinski uses RFID tags 1502 for identification and access (column 18, lines 15-22). After the information stored on the tag 1502 is read, the passenger must verify by entering a password on a keypad within the elevator car (column 19, lines 21-27). These tags do not detect

an authentication signal unique to a person and do not generate an identification signal upon correspondence between the authentication signal and a person reference in response to a check by the device.

Applicant further notes that Svensson-Hilford is directed to payment authorization and not to access authorization. As long as the user can authorize payment, the user has access to the elevator system.

The Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford teaches the step of "generating at least one authentication signal associated with a person seeking to use the elevator installation" (column 2, lines 36-40; and line 66 through column 3, line 4) recited in Applicant's Claim 1. The description at column 2, lines 36-40 relates to the sensor 8 monitoring the position of the traction sheave 5 and has absolutely nothing to do with an "authentication signal associated with a person seeking to use the elevator installation". The description at column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 4 relates to the identification device 15 for identifying user data and/or means of payment in order for the elevator system to charge for the trip. Nothing in the portions of Svensson-Hilford cited by the Examiner describes or suggests an authentication signal is unique to the person seeking to utilize the elevator system as recited in Applicant's claims.

The Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford teaches the step of "detecting the at least one authentication signal with a mobile authentication device" (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-35) recited in Applicant's Claim 1. Svensson-Hilford does not teach the use of "a mobile authentication device" to detect an authentication signal. The description at column 4, lines 6-14 relates to the identification devices 15 receiving data. The devices 15 are fixed at the floors and in the elevator car and are wired to the calculation device 16 as shown in Figs. 1-3. The description at column 4, lines 28-35 relates to the identification device 15 (not mobile) and to the destination input devices 14 that are fixed at the floors and are wired to the calculation device 16 as shown in Fig. 2. Nothing in the portions of Svensson-Hilford cited by the Examiner describes or suggests detecting an authentication signal with a mobile authentication device as recited in Applicant's claims.

Steps c) and d) of Applicant's Claim 1 also recite the mobile authentication device which is not taught by Svensson-Hilford. Regarding step d), the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford teaches "the mobile authentication device providing at least one identification code" (column 4,

lines 6-14; lines 28-35). The description at column 4, lines 6-14 relates to the identification devices 15 receiving data. The identification devices 15 are not a mobile authentication device as recited in Applicant's claims and do not generate an identification code in response to correspondence of the authentication signal and the person reference. The identification device 15 simply reads in or receives data and transmits that data to the calculation device 16. The same is true of the destination input device 14 by which an access code is inputted and transmitted to the calculation device 16.

Regarding step e) of Claim 1, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford teaches "detecting the at least one identification code with a stationary recognition device of the elevator installation" (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-35). Since the Examiner did not identify a "stationary recognition device", Applicant assumes that the Examiner is referring to the calculation device 16. However, the Svensson-Hilford calculation device 16 performs an evaluation of the data received from the identification device 15 and checks for authorization to use a transportation service. Therefore, the calculation device 16 can't be detecting an identification code provided by a mobile authentication device which code isn't generated until correspondence of the authentication signal and the person reference.

Regarding step f) of Claim 1, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford teaches "assigning to the identification code one of a predefined travel destination and an input travel destination input at the recognition device by the person" (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-35). The cited portions of Svensson-Hilford relate to evaluating individual data in relation to individual transportation conditions. There is no suggestion of assigning one of a predefined travel destination and an input travel destination input at the recognition device by the person to an identification code.

The invention recited in Applicant's claims relates to a method for a double security check in front of an elevator installation. For doing so, the person to be checked carries a mobile authentication device similar to a credit card and which may comprise a sensor, a processor and a memory with a person reference. The person to be checked performs a first authentication test by taking a biometric signal with the sensor; the processor compares the biometric signal with the person reference and issues an identification code if the authentication test is positive. The identification code is an RF signal generated by the mobile authentication device, which signal is

detected by a stationary recognition device of the elevator installation. The elevator installation comprises a processor and a memory with a user reference. The processor compares the identification code with the user reference. If this second identification test is positive, a control signal is issued to an elevator control in order to transport the person to a travel destination. Thus, the mobile authentication device identifies the user and then the stationary recognition device confirms the identification.

The Examiner stated that Claim 19 has limitations similar to those of Claims 1- 6, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claims 1-6. Applicant's arguments stated above also apply to the rejection of Claim 19.

The Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. However, there was no identification of additional prior in the Office Action and no Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) was attached.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above arguments, Applicant believes that the claims of record now define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.